REMARKS

The above Amendments and these Remarks are in reply to the Office Action mailed January 27, 2005.

Prior to entry of this Response C, claims 1-27 are pending. Applicants have amended claims 19 and 24, cancelled claims 20-23, and added claims 28-30. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of claims 1-19 and 24-27 and consideration of newly added claims 28-30.

I. Interview Summary

An interview was conducted between Applicants' representative and Examiner Mirza on July 18, 2005. The Examiner is thanked for the opportunity to discuss the invention and office action.

Claim 1 and U.S. Pat. App. Pub. No. 2003/0084121 ("*DeBoor*") were discussed.

The alternate amendments of claim 1 to recite a "providing at least one edit page from said server machine to said client machine to receive information for the field of the template if it is determined to be necessary to obtain information to complete the field," and wherein "said template is at least one of a message creation template, an appointment scheduling template, and a database query submission template" were discussed.

Applicants' representative argued that the combination of *DeBoor* and *Kikinis* fails to teach or suggest either of these limitations.

The Examiner indicated that further consideration would be required.

II. Rejection of Claims 1-27 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 1-27 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Pat. App. Pub. No. 2003/0084121 ("*DeBoor*") and U.S. Patent No. 6,553,410 ("*Kikinis*"). Claims 20-23 have been cancelled. Because the combination of *DeBoor* and *Kikinis* fails to teach or suggest each of the limitations of claims 1-19 and 24-27 pending after entry of the present amendments, Applicants assert that claims 1-19 and 24-27 are patentable over the cited art.

Claims 1-18

Claim 1 recites

> "storing, at said server machine, a template having pre-defined user data for use in performing server actions, wherein the template includes
>
> a plurality of fields,
>
> attribute data associated with each of the fields, and
>
> previously entered user data associated with at least one field of said plurality" *(Emphasis added).*

It is respectfully submitted that the combination of *DeBoor* and *Kikinis* fails to teach or suggest "previously entered user data associated with at least one field of said plurality," as recited in claim 1.

The template recited in claim 1 includes previously entered user data so that a server action can be performed by using this previously entered user data rather than obtaining the needed information from the client device at the time of the request for the server action. *DeBoor's* user interface pages are simply pages or an interface that is used to control the telecommunications feature of a wireless device. *DeBoor*, p. 2, ¶ 0024. There is nothing in *DeBoor* to suggest that one of these user interface pages includes "previously entered user data" that can be used to perform a server action as recited in claim 1.

The Examiner cites page 14, ¶ 0235 of *DeBoor* (it appears the teaching is actually in ¶ 0236) for the disclosure of this limitation. Applicants respectfully disagree. Applicants note that this limitation specifically recites "previously entered user data," and not just "pre-defined data," as the Examiner discusses. The Examiner's rejection states that one of ordinary skill in the art "knows that the data being fetched stored under the variable 'name' considered as pre-defined data." *Office Action*, p. 11. However, the mere disclosure of "pre-defined data" does not disclose "previously entered user data" as recited in claim 1. Data can be pre-defined without being previously entered user data. Thus, just because *DeBoor* may include some pre-defined data does not teach or suggest the inclusion of "previously entered user data." Nevertheless, there is nothing in *DeBoor* that teaches or suggests this data stored under the variable "name" was previously entered by a user. The cited portion simply does not disclose where this data under the variable "name" originated. It only mentions that it is stored.

Kikinis has not been cited for and Applicants assert that *Kikinis* fails to teach or suggest this limitation. Thus, because *DeBoor* and *Kikinis* fail to teach or suggest a template for use in peforming server actions that includes "previously entered user data," Applicants assert that claim 1 is patentable over the cited art under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a). Claims 2-18 each ultimately depend from claim 1 and should be patentable for at least the same reasons.

Claim 19

Claim 19 has been amended to recite that:

> "each of said templates includes a plurality of fields previously indicated to be editable or non-editable by a user defining said template"

It is respectfully submitted that *DeBoor* and *Kikinis*, either alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest such a limitation.

DeBoor relates to "various user interface pages written in a markup language" that define "the telecommunication control and other functions of the wireless communication device." *DeBoor, p. 2, ¶ 0024.* These user interface pages are in no way "user-defined" as claim 19 recites. Moreover, there is nothing within *DeBoor* that can be construed to suggest that it includes fields that are "previously indicated to be editable or non-editable by a user defining said template," as claims 19 recites. Quite simply, the "user interface pages" of *DeBoor* are defined by the manufacturer or provider of the wireless communication device, not a user of such a device.

DeBoor at p. 16, ¶¶ 0267-0273 was cited for teaching claim 3 which contains limitations relating to editable fields. These paragraphs contain nothing to suggest fields "previously indicated to be editable or non-editable by a user defining said template." These paragraphs simply discuss "a mechanism for including HTML (which also includes plain text) from any source by giving its URL" which is used "primarily to display device settings via template pages." *DeBoor, p. 16, ¶ 0268.* There is nothing within this citation of *DeBoor* that relates in anyway to template fields "previously indicated to be or editable or non-editable by a user defining said template," as recited in claim 19.

Kikinis is similarly deficient in its teachings. *Kikinis* at col. 26, ll. 1-29 teaches the creation of templates whereby "a user can designate zones (FIG. 13b)" of a Web page and

"incorporate these zones into a template for specifying translation of the Web page for a client device." *Kikinis* is simply teaching an embodiment that allows "a user or WEB page owner (or representative) to choose a maximum zone size according to the capabilities of the targeted client device." *Id.* There is nothing in this teaching, however, to suggest that a user can designate fields of a template as an "editable field or a non-editable field," as recited in claim 19. *Kikinis* only teaches a that a user can create a template "adapted to translate WEB pages into content-reduced WEB pages adapted for a specific client and/or application." *Id. at col. 25, ll. 54-58.* This does not relate to user input which indicates "whether each of said first plurality of fields is an editable field or a non-editable field," as recited in claim 19.

Claim 19 further recites:

> "providing at least one edit page from said server machine to said client machine for each field previously indicated to be editable by said user defining said template"

There is no teaching or suggestion in the combination of *DeBoor* and *Kikinis* for such a limitation. *DeBoor* simply teaches "user interface pages" stored "in a local memory of the wireless communication device." They are stored at a server and the server does not have access to them. Thus, there is no providing of at least one edit page from a server machine to a client machine as claim 28 recites. Moreover, the user interface pages in the device of *DeBoor* are not provided in anyway based on whether a "user defining said template" indicated portions of them to be editable. As mentioned previously, *DeBoor* doesn't suggest that his pages are user definable at all. Thus, there can be no providing of edit pages "for each field indicated to be editable by said user defining said template," as recited in claim 19.

Kikinis discloses "data templates" and "Mark-Scripts" which are "a cross between a list of bookmarks and a script." *Kikinis, col. 27, ll. 32-49.* Nothing in the teachings of these scripts or templates provides for or suggests the transmission of edit pages "from said server machine to said client machine" as claim 19 recites. *Kikinis* also discloses that a user can "make new templates for specific WEB pages and client devices and appliances." *Kikinis, col. 26, ll. 1-18.* This can be done by a client "accessing a special WEB page." *Id.* Nothing in this limited disclosure relates to or suggests any customization of this special WEB page based on a previous indication by a user. Thus, there is no suggestion in *Kikinis* of providing edit pages "for each field previously indicated to be editable by said user defining said template."

Because the combination of *DeBoor* and *Kikinis*, either alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest each of the limitations of claim 19, Applicants assert that claim 19 is patentable over the cited art under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

Claims 24-27

Claim 24, as amended, recites:

> "receiving first user input for a template, said template is at least one of a message generation template, an appointment scheduling template, and a database query submission template"

It is respectfully submitted that *DeBoor* and *Kikinis*, either alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest a "message generation template," "an appointment scheduling template," or "a database query submission template."

As previously described, *DeBoor* discloses "various user interface pages written in a markup language" which define "the telecommunication control and other functions of the wireless device." *DeBoor, p. 2, ¶ 0024.* There is nothing in *DeBoor* that teaches or suggests that these interface pages include a "message generation template," "an appointment scheduling template," or "a database query submission template," as recited in claim 24. The Examiner has cited *DeBoor* where email is mentioned. At p. 8, ¶ 117, *DeBoor* describes that objects for displaying different types of data can include a "list of text messages/alpha-numeric pages that have been received or sent" and that the "message list object stores a list of messages, including email or Short Message Service messages, and includes methods to view, store, edit, delete, and send messages." While this disclosure mentions editing and sending messages, there is nothing to suggest a template that can be used for "message generation," as claim 24 recites. The Examiner has also cited p. 18, ¶ 315 of *DeBoor* for disclosing appointment scheduling. Applicants assert however, that this paragraph does not mention appointment scheduling. This paragraph recites a "name/value data-set active in the form of the current page" in discussing the effects of a NEXT method. There is no mention of appointment scheduling.

The Examiner cited *Kikinis* at col. 12, ll. 37-41 which states that "a digital camera apparatus is provided with the hand-held unit, and a user can snap digital pictures and send the data to the Proxy-Server or to any other machine on the Internet by E-mail." While this portion

mentions email, there is nothing to suggest a "message generation template," as recited in claim 24. *Kikinis* at col. 14, ll. 41-53 was also cited which discusses enhanced email functions and states that "the appropriate database is updated at step 143 in file system 145." It goes on to state that: examples of "such databases are an appointment schedule, a ToDo list, a project file, a contacts file, and resumes;" there are "many more databases that might be updated as well;" and that "notifications of changes in a database are sent to appropriate offsite addresses." In all of this discussion, *Kikinis* does not discuss templates. The teachings pertain to the disclosed modified system that has "three file systems 123, 125, and 127 for storing E-mail in different versions." *Id. at col. 14, ll. 31-33.* Thus, *Kikinis* does not teach or suggest "message generation template[s]," "appointment scheduling template[s]," or "database query submission template[s]."

Accordingly, because the combination of *DeBoor* and *Kikinis* fail to teach or suggest the above limitation of claim 24, Applicants assert that claim 24 is patentable over the cited art under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a). Claims 25-27 each ultimately depend from claim 24 and should be patentable for at least the same reasons.

III. Newly Added Claim 28

Newly added claim 28 recites that "first user input" is received to "create a user-defined template" and that:

> "said first user input indicates whether each of said first plurality of fields is an editable field or a non-editable field"

It is respectfully submitted that *DeBoor* and *Kikinis*, either alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest such a limitation. As shown with respect to claim 19, *DeBoor* and *Kikinis* fail to teach or suggest receiving input from a first user that "indicates whether each of said first plurality of fields is an editable field or a non-editable field."

Claim 28 goes even further to recite:

> "receiving a request from a client machine to perform a first server action using said template, said first server action requires user input for a second plurality of fields corresponding to said first plurality of fields of said template" *(Emphasis added)*

The Examiner's rejection of the previously pending independent claims is premised upon the "user interface pages" of *DeBoor* which the Examiner has asserted to include a plurality of fields. Newly added claim 28 makes it explicitly clear that the template includes "a first plurality of fields," and that the server action for which the template is used "requires user input for a second plurality of fields." *(Emphasis added)*. Thus, even if *DeBoor* were to teach a template having multiple fields (a position with which Applicants still disagree and are not acquiescing in), there is clearly no further teaching of a server action requiring user input for a "second plurality of fields" as claim 28 recites.

The use of a template having a "first plurality of fields" in the performance of a "server action [that] requires user input for a second plurality of fields" makes it "possible to reduce the information that the user of the source machine must enter." *See Applicant's Specification*, pp. 6-7. "[A] server can determine which fields require interactive completion, and need request information only for those fields." *Id.* This idea is captured in claim 28 which goes on to recite:

> "providing at least one edit page from said server machine to said client machine to receive information for each field in said first plurality of fields indicated to be an editable field by said first user input, said at least one edit page is provided for less than all of said second plurality of fields requiring user input for said first server action" *(Emphasis added)*

There is no teaching or suggestion in the combination of *DeBoor* and *Kikinis* for such a limitation. First, there is no transmission of edit pages "from said server machine to said client machine" in *DeBoor* or *Kikinis* as discussed with respect to claim 19.

In claim 28, the use of fields "indicated to be an editable field by said first user input" is further significant in that it allows said at least one edit page to be "provided for less than all of said second plurality of fields requiring user input for said server action." Nothing within *DeBoor* or *Kikinis* provides for the suggestion or ability to provide at least one edit page "for less than all of said second plurality of fields requiring user input for said first server action," when performing a server action as recited in claim 28. This allows the server action to be performed with limited input and transmission from the client machine to the server machine. Nothing in *DeBoor* and *Kikinis* teaches or suggest anything of this sort that would allow one to perform a server action using an edit page that "is provided for less than all of said second plurality of fields requiring user input for said server action."

Because the combination of *DeBoor* and *Kikinis* fail to teach or suggest each of the limitations of newly added claim 28, Applicants assert that claim 28 is patentable over the cited art. Claims 29-30 each ultimately depend from claim 28 and should be patentable for at least the same reasons.

V. Conclusion

Based on the above amendments and these remarks, reconsideration of claims 1-19 and 24-27 and consideration of newly added claims 28-30 is respectfully requested.

The Examiner's prompt attention to this matter is greatly appreciated. Should further questions remain, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney by telephone.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any underpayment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 501826 for any matter in connection with this response, including any fee for extension of time, which may be required.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: July 27, 2005

By: _____
David E. Cromer
Reg. No. 54,768

VIERRA MAGEN MARCUS HARMON & DENIRO LLP
685 Market Street, Suite 540
San Francisco, California 94105-4206
Telephone: (415) 369-9660
Facsimile: (415) 369-9665